DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 109 PS 020 623

AUTHOR Burgett, Maxine
TITLE Determining and Implementing Quality Exploratory Field Experience in Early Childhood Education through Improved Interaction.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 114p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *College Students; Cooperating Teachers; *Curriculum Enrichment; Early Childhood Education; *Education Courses; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preschool Teachers; Student Experience; Student Journals; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This practicum report describes an intervention to improve the quality of college students' experiences during their placement in a child care center as part of an introductory course in early childhood education. As a result of the intervention, 12 outcomes were expected. These outcomes were divided into 21 standards of achievement. Of these, 7 standards, such as writing weekly entries in logs, applied to students; 3 standards, such as reporting about the needs of students, applied to day care center teachers; 10 standards, such as completing questionnaires, applied to the course instructor; and 1 standard, offering a contractual agreement to the course instructor, applied to the school administration. The intervention included: (1) visits by the instructor to the child care centers; (2) the use of logs by students and the instructor; (3) discussion of students' field experiences during class time; (4) orientation sessions for students and child care teachers; (5) the development and use of a handbook; and (6) reports by child care teachers about students' experiences. The success of the intervention was measured by analysis of questionnaire responses and written records, such as logs and reports. During or as a result of the intervention, 17 standards were fully met and 4 were partially met. A reference list of 24 items is provided. Appendices include the report form for child care teachers, questionnaires for students and teachers, and forms for assessing outcomes and standards of achievement. (BC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED352109

# Determining and Implementing Quality Exploratory Field Experience in Early Childhood Education through Improved Interaction

by

Maxine Burgett

Cluster XL

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maxine Burgett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 020623

A Practicum I Report Presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Jeanette Smith

Jeanette Smith

Jeanette
Smith

Associate Professor of Education

Canton, Ohio

January 13, 1992

This practicum report was submitted by Maxine Burgett under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

January 23, 1992

Date of Final Approval of Report

June S. Delano, Ph.D., Adviser

June S. Delano

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following individuals are acknowledged for their support, encouragement, and assistance in the development and implementation of this field experience project.

Larry Burgett, whose love, care, and sacrifice made this endeavor possible;

Jeanette Smith, whose enthusiasm and suggestions spurred thoughts into action;

Martha Cook and other college leaders, who valued the project by making logistic changes and offering compensation;

Peggy Richards, who printed the Introduction to Field Experience Handbook;

Jeffrey Pittman, whose computer expertise polished this document;

Field experience students of Introduction to Early Childhood Education class, who diligently completed course requirements and freely communicated their ideas;

Cooperating teachers, who shared professional expertise and insight;

and

The Lord, who is my rock and source of daily strength.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | | v |
| LIST OF FIGURES | | vi |
| Chapter | | |
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Description of Work Setting and Community | 1 |
| | Writer's Work Setting and Role | 1 |
| II | STUDY OF THE PROBLEM | 4 |
| | Problem Description | 4 |
| | Problem Documentation | 5 |
| | Causative Analysis | 7 |
| | Relationship of the Problem to the Literature | 7 |
| III | ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS | 17 |
| | Goals and Expectations | 17 |
| | Expected Outcomes | 17 |
| | Measurement of Outcomes | 23 |
| IV | SOLUTION STRATEGY | 24 |
| | Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions | 24 |
| | Description of Selected Solution | 28 |
| | Report of Action Taken | 29 |
| V | RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 34 |
| | Results | 34 |
| | Discussion | 50 |
| | Recommendations | 51 |
| | Dissemination | 52 |
| REFERENCES | | 54 |

Appendices


A LETTER STATING COURSE OBJECTIVES . . . . . 57

B COOPERATING TEACHER REPORT FORM . . . . . 60

C FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . 62

D COOPERATING TEACHER/SITE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . . 65

E OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT FORM . . . . . 69

F STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT ASSESSMENT FORM . . . 72

G EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELD EXPERIENCE HANDBOOK . . . 76


## LIST OF TABLES

Table


1 Field Experience Interactions Completed for Introduction to Early Childhood Education Course, Fall, 1990 . . . . . 6

2 Outcomes Assessment . . . . . 35

3 Standards of Achievement Assessment . . . . . 37

4 Field Experience Student (FES) Questionnaire Responses . . . . . 41

5 Questionnaire Responses from Cooperating Teacher/ Site Administrators Referring to Previous Field Experience Process . . . . . 44

6 Questionnaire Responses from Cooperating Teacher/ Site Administrators Referring to New Field Experience Process . . . . . 46

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1 Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to Field Experience Students . . . . . 18

2 Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to Cooperating Teachers . . . . . 19

3 Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to Instructor/Supervisor . . . . . 20

4 Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to College Leadership . . . . . 22

## ABSTRACT

Determining and Implementing Quality Exploratory Field Experience in Early Childhood Education through Improved Interaction. Burgett, Maxine, 1992: Practicum I Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Descriptors: Cooperating Teachers/Clinical Experience/ Experiential Learning Programs/Field Experience Programs/ Field Instruction/Field Laboratory Experience/Preservice Teacher Education/Supervising Teachers/Supervisory Methods.

The goal of this practicum was that students in a college Introduction to Early Childhood Education course would participate in a coordinated, quality field experience. The objectives were to (1) identify the needs and expectations of the field experience students, the cooperating teachers, the instructor/supervisor, and college leadership; (2) design and implement procedures for interactive communication of these needs and expectations. Through this process, a viable, quality field experience system would be established.

The instructor/supervisor developed an Introduction to Early Childhood Education Field Experience Handbook; conducted a cooperating teacher/administrator orientation; designed a course agenda integrating field experience with text information which included log-writing; formed and interacted with a field experience committee; and made on-site visitations with field experience students and cooperating teachers.

Design and use of communication tools and processes led to the instructor/supervisor's awarness of needs, concerns, and strengths of the field experience program as perceived by field experience students and field experience site staff. Likewise, the students and the field experience site staff gained knowledge of the needs and expectations of the instructor/supervisor and college course goals. Decision-making college personnel recognized the need for change. Thus, these interactions created a bond of commonality and unity of purpose which did offer students in Introduction to Early Childhood Education distinctive and valuable field experience.


*******

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (X) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

January 13, 1992 (date)

Maxine Burgett (signature)

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### Description of Work Setting and Community

In northcentral United States a small college emphasizes a Christian liberal arts approach to education. This institution produces graduates, not only for the marketplace, but for all aspects of life. Its mission features communicative and interpretive skills in preparing the whole student: physically, mentally, spiritually, and emotionally. The seventy-eight acre campus is located in a quiet residential area of a mid-sized city where a blend of cultural, business, educational, and industrial endeavors abound and strive to meet current challenges: employment, educational funding, and healthy, safe community living.

Elementary and secondary teacher education has for more than two decades been a predominant feature of the college program. The Associate Degree in Early Childhood Education is an expansion of the educational offerings, and its current creditability and need are endorsed by the state issuance of the pre-kindergarten teacher certificate. The early childhood program, operating as part of the Education/Psychology Department of the college, encompasses courses specifically designed for students pursuing a career in the early childhood profession. Field experience and student teaching at the pre-kindergarten level are a required portion of the Associate Degree. Hence, the

college campus nursery school operates as a training laboratory for these students. This center offers morning and afternoon preschool sessions for children three to five years old as well as an infant-toddler program with a parent education component. Here both psychology and education students participate in hands-on field experiences with young children.

## Writer's Work Setting and Role

The writer is beginning her sixth year as a part-time early childhood education instructor at this college. The Introduction to Early Childhood Education course is among several courses taught by the author during a typical school year. A majority of the students enrolled in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course are traditional first semester freshmen beginning preparation for an Associate in Early Childhood Education Degree or a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary and Pre-Kindergarten Education. A smaller portion of the class are non-traditional students entering college and some students beyond freshman level who seek to add pre-kindergarten education to their credentials. The required two-semester hour course is designed to inform the students of career opportunities available, to teach skills necessary for observation of young children, and to identify necessary

competency areas for teachers of young children. Class time is a one-hour and forty-minute session once a week for the fifteen-week semester.

One requirement for this course is a field experience for a total of twenty hours. In addition to teaching the course, placement and coordination of students in this field experience is the responsibility of the writer.

# CHAPTER II

## STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

### Problem Description

A quality field experience procedure needed to be identified and implemented for students enrolled in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course. The writer, also course instructor, solely coordinated the field experience in the following manner. Communication via letter and in person was made by the course instructor with the administrators of each site/program where students were to be placed for field experience. Sites included a variety of preschool/child care programs in the community. One site was the campus preschool, two sites were within walking distance of the campus, and others were more distant requiring student transportation. Student placement for the field experience was determined by: (1) acceptable, developmentally appropriate model offered by site program, (2) students' experiential and educational background, (3) students' age-level interest (infant-toddler, preschool, kindergarten age), (4) students' available transportation, and (5) other factors such as students' class and work schedules.

With this process, the needs of the cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students were not known to the instructor, and therefore were not addressed. The students and course instructor interacted with each other regarding course content, however, the amount of classroom

time spent discussing the simultaneous field experience was limited. The students and cooperating teacher interacted with each other during the on-site field experience, but interaction between the course instructor, the cooperating teachers, students on site, and program administrators was inadequate.

In summation, a viable interaction process for meeting the educational goals and needs of college students, cooperating teachers, program administrators, and course instructor was not in place. Thus, the students enrolled in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course participated in a loosely coordinated, mediocre field experience.

## Problem Documentation

Documentation of the inadequate interaction process can be seen in the field experience operation of the Fall 1990 Introduction to Early Childhood Education Course. The practice was that of minimal communication of instructor/supervisor with field experience students on site, with cooperating teachers, and with administrators. Table 1 relates the specific facts of these interactions.

Also, conversations with on-site personnel raised questions and concerns regarding student field experiences. Among these issues were: (1) student accountability, (2) amount and type of student interaction with children, and (3) amount and type of students' interaction with cooperating teachers.

Table 1

Field Experience Interactions Completed for Introduction to Early Childhood Education Course, Fall 1990.

| Component | Interaction |
|---|---|
| 65 Students enrolled | 0 On-site visits made by instructor/supervisor |
| 20 Cooperating teachers | 0 Written communications between cooperating teachers and instructor/ supervisor |
| | 0 Orientation/training sessions of cooperating teachers by college personnel |
| | 2 Informal verbal interactions between cooperating teachers and instructor/supervisor |
| 9 Program administrators | 9 Communications of instructor/supervisor with program administrators |

The only informative communication between the instructor/supervisor and the program administrators was a letter sent at the onset of the field experiences. The course objectives and basic procedures were offered in this letter as seen in Appendix A.

The limited discourse between instructor/supervisor and on-site staff and field experience students verified need for change. A further investigation of causes and possible solutions was in order.

## Causative Analysis

The major cause of the problem revolved around the lack of action by the instructor/supervisor to develop and implement an effective field experience system. The instructor/supervisor had not spent time researching potential improvements and only a few comments from students and on-site personnel suggested alterations were needed. In addition, no recommendations for change had been made by the college faculty. The instructor/supervisor, being employed part-time by the college and part-time in related work, had confined time schedules. Therefore, the field experience component was operated with limited attention of the instructor/supervisor. Furthermore, the instructor/supervisor's part-time college contract and compensation presented this course as a typical two-semester hour course with no mention of field experience. The instructor/supervisor had not clarified the situation with college decision-makers.

Hence, the fundamental cause for the inadequate field experience interaction was the instructor/ supervisor's lack of initiative to bring about change.

## Relationship of Problem to Literature

Review of the literature provides evidence of problems with implementation procedures for exploratory field experiences. Applegate (1985), Bonar (1985), and Laskley,

Applegate, and Ellison (1986) present an aggregate of field experience issues revolving around college students, cooperating teachers, and college instructor/supervisors who encounter plights with programs, institutions, and individuals. In addition, what students learn and whether miseducation or transformation occurs during field experiences depends upon a number of variables (Armaline & Hoover, 1989; Goodman, 1985).

Such variables as individual student backgrounds, student-cooperating teacher rapport, and theory-practice match are elements affecting field experience students. College students enter first field experiences with expectations based upon sketchy memories of their early school encounters (Armaline & Hoover, 1989). Therefore, integrating past experiences with present on-site happenings challenges these students. Applegate (1985) points out that these students also are frequently dismayed by the lack of relationship between what is happening at the field experience site and what they are being taught in the classroom. Thus, student bewilderment swells when college theories and school practices differ (Cohn & Gellman, 1988). When meshing field experience and campus classroom experience, students need clarification about activities and how they relate to each other (Cunningham, Bower, & McGhee, 1983-1984). Calderhead (1988) also calls attention to the frequent lack of viable college student observational systems.

In this writer's work setting student concerns correspond to many of those mentioned in the literature

review. Most of the students in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course are first-semester freshmen with no previous field experience. Although developmentally appropriate practice sites are sought, the variety of ecologies and educational approaches vary from one classroom to another where differences in everyday teacher actions do surface. No two program sites are identical. Therefore, each student faces different environments with differing qualities. This instructor/supervisor is consequently summoned to develop the students' observational skills and to assist students in interpreting those observations which provide meaning to course reading and campus classroom presentations.

Dilemmas related to cooperating teachers in field experiences are numerous. Many of these arise because of unfulfilled expectations (Applegate, 1985). Applegate and Lasley (1982) present three main problem areas for cooperating teachers: (1) students'orientation to the field experience, (2) comprehension of the triad (cooperating teacher, instructor/supervisor, and student) relationship, and (3) professional traits and abilities expected of field experience students.

Often the foundational goals for a quality experience are not communicated. Hence, cooperating teachers are unsure about the exploratory field experience student's role with their group of young children. So some cooperating teachers may offer little interaction opportunity while others encourage full student participation (Applegate, 1985).

According to McIntyre and Killian (1986), supervision in

most field experience programs is the responsibility of the cooperating teachers. Yet cooperating teachers expect college faculty to make on site visits and be available to help (Applegate, 1985). For a quality experience, the communication bridge needs to be crossed and partnership must emerge.

Another problem factor is the cooperating teachers' conceptions of the beginning field experience students' professional traits and abilities. Although the field experience student may be a first-semester freshman, wearing the label of "early childhood college student" places high expectations in the minds of many cooperating teachers. As a result, when professional attitudes, skills, initiative, enthusiasm, planning, organization or flexibility are not consistently displayed by the novice student, the cooperating teacher becomes frustrated (Applegate & Laskley, 1982; Applegate, 1985).

In their study of elementary and secondary field experience programs, McIntyre and Killian (1986) found that cooperating teachers provide minimal feedback regarding field experience students' performance. Furthermore, the written comments were positive with no critical citations or recommendations for improvement (Applegate, 1985; McIntyre & Killian, 1986). An underlying, related fact is that few colleges provide any training for cooperating teachers beyond an orientation (Bonar, 1985). Applegate (1985) refers to Isler and Kay's 1981 study of field experience programs. This study states that even though most evaluation of students in early field experience is done by cooperating

teachers, only 20% of the institutions offer supervisory or evaluating techniques training for site staff (Applegate).

Two other factors affect early childhood cooperating teachers' impact upon the quality of field experiences: process of selecting cooperating teachers and qualifications of these teachers. Teacher selection is often narrowed by site location (near campus or student transportation availability). In addition, cooperating teachers are typically selected by the center principal or administrator (Bonar, 1985). The qualifications of teachers in early childhood programs is one significant difference between elementary/secondary field experiences and experiences at early childhood sites (Katz, 1982; Spodek & Davis, 1982). Katz reports that "the younger the child being taught, the less training the teacher is likely to have" and "the fewer qualifications required" (p. 1).

Meeting the needs and related issues of cooperating teachers were plights in the writer's circumstances. Little direct contact was previously made by the instructor/supervisor with these teachers in either verbal, written, or personal interaction. Written feedback from each cooperating teacher was not a part of the field experience system. The administrators selected teachers with whom each field experience student was placed and the type and amount of training of these teachers varied widely. Some teachers such as those in the public school kindergarten classroom possess a college degree. Other teachers employed by early childhood centers licensed by the Department of Human Services may have a Child Development Associate (CDA)

certificate or only the minimum requirement of forty-five hours of inservice training. Therefore, the instructor/supervisor of the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course faced many of the cooperating teacher issues presented in the literature.

The responsibilities and skills necessary for field experience effectiveness places college faculty in a liaison role (Faria, Brownstein, & Smith, (1988). Acting as advisor, monitor, consultant, mediator, and advocate, the college teacher needs skill in interpersonal communication as well as the ability to integrate students' field experiences with campus classroom agenda (Faria, et al.; Lasley, et al., 1986). Defining and communicating the roles of field experience students, cooperating teachers and instructor/supervisors is a major issue according to deLaski-Smith and Hansen (1983), Faria, et al., and Killian and McIntyre (1988). Simmons (1989) emphasizes the human relations of this endeavor which requires attentiveness, patience, and flexibility of the field experience supervisor. This challenge is particularly apparent when working with a cooperating teacher whose school situations are far from ideal (Erdman, (1983). The job of instructor/supervisor also entails defining how students will be supervised (Cunningham, et al., 1983-1984) and addressing the need for adequately trained cooperating teachers (Goodman, 1988; Korinek, 1989; McIntryre, 1986). In dealing with these many program components, knowledge about other college programs as well as college policies and procedures are essential (Lasley, et.al.).

With these necessities for providing distinctive field experiences comes the time and fatigue facet. Scheduling, travelling, and conferencing take college faculty away from traditional scholary responsibilities (Applegate, 1985; Simmons, 1989). The time these duties require is the main reason most programs offer very limited or no supervision for early field experience (Goodman, 1988; OShea, Hoover, & Carroll, 1988). Yet, the college teacher is challenged to clearly and consistently communicate with site staff and supervise field experience students amid these time constraints (Bonar, 1985).

The instructor/supervisor's part-time work schedule was an influencing factor regarding the quality of field experience. As discussed by Applegate (1985), Simmons (1989), Bonar (1985) and others, communicating means time investment. Working part-time, as the term expresses, means the job does not consume full-time labor, and the interaction was that of doing the best possible in the allotted time. The instructor/supervisor possessed the necessary human relationships skills Simmons mentions, but time restrictions prohibited their implementation. The part-time position also provided a partial picture of college policies and procedures. To bring about change in the part-time role, extra plans, contacts, and action were needed to gain information and influence. So, the issues presented by the literature were relevant to this writer's situation and were even more prominent concerns due to the part-time role.

The college administrative aspect of exploratory field experiences can be viewed from three perspectives:

(1) collegiate leadership attitude, (2) supervision time, and (3) handling logistics (Applegate, 1985); Goodman, 1988; Lasley, et al., 1986; Spodek & Davis, 1982). The attitude of higher education decision-makers frequently is that of "let as is" (Applegate). As a result, the collegiate "culture impedes efforts to reform field experiences" (Goodman, 1988, p.45). Lack of college resources and the low status of clientele (women and children) obstruct renovation according to Goodman. Therefore, serious questions must be raised, convincing evidence of need must be provided, and monitarily attractive ideas must be suggested before reform occurs (Applegate, 1985; Goodman). Applegate, Goodman, and Lasley et al. also address the issue of inadequate compensation for faculty supervision of field experience. Added to this perplexity is the fact that early childhood teacher education programs are relatively new and among the politically weakest departments in institutions of higher education (Spodek & Davis, 1982). Their relative youth, small size and tendency to have new, non-tenured faculty stunt early childhood education program opportunities for recognition and empowerment (Spodek & Davis). These varied professional perspectives and philosophies cause struggles in promoting a unified effort (Goodman).

The college management system of field experience for the early childhood course is an issue this instructor/supervisor encountered as well. Larger course enrollments and change of instructors (from full-time faculty who administers the on-campus child development center to this part-time instructor/supervisor) presented

complications. Compensation was offered as though this were a traditional college course, when in fact, the field experience component extended the instructor responsibilities as well as student educational opportunities. Therefore, the course was not a typical one, yet was financially compensated as such.

In summary, the literature reviewed divulges sundry issues related to the four-component field experience program involving students, cooperating teachers, instructor/supervisor and collegiate leadership. Individual student backgrounds, student-cooperating teacher rapport, and theory-practice match are issues facing field experience students. Cooperating teachers, having varied qualifications, experience unfufilled expectations and respond to field experience students and the college program in varied ways. With no specific supervisory training and little or no instructor/supervisor contact, results of the student-cooperating teacher interaction are often left to happenstance. The instructor/supervisor must assume the many traits of a liaison. She needs to clarify roles, enhance human relations, cope with varied quality site ecologies, and identify cooperating teacher needs. While striving to manage time constraints, this faculty member must stay abreast of college programs, policies and procedures to advocate for the field experience program needs. Prominant among these needs are those of valuing the field experience component by the collegiate leadership and the logical response of financial allocations for a quality field experience.

Authors in the field present needs, problems and their causes which, in most points, coincide with those in the writer's situation. Their review, clarification, and adaptations were the foundation for determining and implementing a quality field experience in this writer's early childhood education work setting.

# CHAPTER III

# ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

## Goals and Expectations

The goal of this practicum was that the students in Introduction to Early Childhood Education would participate in a coordinated, quality field experience. The needs and expectations of the field experience students, the cooperating teachers, the instructor/supervisor, and the college leadership were to be identified. Responding to these needs was expected to remedy the inadequate interaction process.

## Expected Outcomes

Expected outcomes, standards of achievement and evaluation tools impacted the four program personnel components: field experience students (FES), cooperating teachers (CT), instructor/supervisor (I/S), and college leadership. Each of these components with corresponding outcomes, standards of achievement, and evaluation tools is depicted in Figures 1,2,3, and 4.

**Figure 1. Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools related to Field Experience Students (FES)**

| Outcome | Standard of Achievement | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|
| FES observes and interacts in an early childhood program | Each FES follows a written schedule for a minimum of two hours weekly field experience for a minimum of ten weeks | FES schedules |
| | Each week each FES writes an entry in own log | FES logs |
| | Each CT documents FES participation weekly and presents to I/S at end of course | CT report form designed by I/S * |
| Each FES verbally expresses to CT and I/S happenings, questions, and insights about the field experience | Documentation of FES stated verbal expressions appear on CT report form | CT report form |
| | For each FES, the I/S log shows two recordings of verbal communication with I/S | I/S log |
| | All FES questionnaires reveal at least two incidents of verbal communication with CT regarding field experience. | FES question-naires designed by I/S ** |
| | Each FES log contains a minimum of two incidents of verbal communication about field experience. | FES log |
| Each FES writes about observations, concerns, insights of field experience | Each FES weekly records observations, concerns, and insights in log | FES log |

* See Appendix B
** See Appendix C

**Figure 2. Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to Cooperating Teachers (CT).**

| Outcome | Standard of Achievement | Evaluation tool |
|---|---|---|
| Each CT has knowledge of needs and expectations of PES and I/S, including college course goals | CT report knowledge of needs and expectations | CT report forms |
| Each CT communicate own needs, expectations, happenings, and concerns regarding field experience | I/S log refers to at least one instance of I/S and CT communication with each CT as stated. | I/S log |
| | All CT state that I/S made at least one on-site communication. | CT question-naires * |

* See Appendix D

**Figure 3. Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tools Related to Instructor/Supervisor (I/S).**

| Outcome | Standard of Achievement | Evaluation tool |
|---|---|---|
| I/S gains knowledge about needs, concerns, and strengths of field experience program as perceived by CT, FES and site program administrators | Five out of every ten questionnaires distributed are completed and returned | Questionnaires completed by CT, FES, and site administrators of last school year |
| | Seven out of every ten questionnaires distributed are completed and returned | Questionnaires completed by CT, FES, and site administrators at end of course |
| I/S selects a representative group of FES, CT, and site administrators to form a field experience committee which meets with I/S to share perspectives about field experience and develop a unity and rapport for a quality program | A total of eight persons (three FES, three CT, and two site program administrators meet two times with I/S, conversing about field experience program as stated. One of these meetings occurs in the formative stage of the project and one occurs at the close of the project. | The I/S or group representative will record minutes of group session |

Figure 3. Expected Outcomes, Standards of Achievement and Evaluation Tooles Related to Instructor/Supervisor (I/S) (Continued).

| Outcome | Standard of Achievement | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|
| I/S develops a printed field experience handbook tailored to the course. This handbook is then distributed and explained to all FES, CT, and site administrators | All FES, CT, and site administrators have a handbook<br><br>All CT and FES report knowledge and implementation of handbook information | Field Experience Handbook for course<br><br>CT report forms and FES log comment |
| I/S conducts field experience orientation sessions, one for CT and site administrators and the other for FES | CT and site administrators attend orientation session (I/S meets separately with whoever cannot attend).<br><br>FES attend campus class orientation session. (I/S communicates separately with whoever cannot attend) | A written record of planned agenda and actual activities |
| I/S arranges for session in which site administrators and CT orient FES to their respective sites just prior to FES first on-site participation time | Site administrators or CT present copy of completed orientation agenda to I/S | Record of orientation agenda by site administrators or CT. |
| I/S makes on-site visits with FES and CT | I/S Makes a minimum of two on-site visits to each FES during the course/practicum time | I/S log |

**Figure 4. Expected Outcome, Standard of Achievement and Evaluation Tool Related to College Leadership.**

| Outcome | Standard of Achievement | Evaluation tool |
|---|---|---|
| Decision-making college personnel recognize time and energies needed for quality field experience component of course and offer compensation to facilitate such | College offers I/S contractual agreement which includes compensation for facilitating field experience component of course | I/S record of actions take and printed information share to communicate need/situation to decision-makers of college |

## Measurement of Outcomes

Outcomes were examined in three ways. First, analysis was made of the calendar plan process steps. This checklist offered information to assess timely completion of the new field experience process.

Secondly, the overall coordination and quality of the practicum was reflected in the number of outcomes and standards of achievement attained. Twelve outcomes and twenty-one standards of achievement were proposed as seen in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4. The assessment for each outcome and each standard was measured in terms of "fully met", "partially met", or "not met".

Thirdly, using the questionnaire responses from last school year's personnel formed the base data for what the program was prior to practicum implementation. At the end of the practicum, persons involved with this process responded to the same questionnaire. Data from these two sets of questionnaires were examined.

In summation, the results were analyzed by: (1) evaluating the process steps as to their timely completion, (2) noting the number of outcomes and standards of achievement that were met, and (3) comparing results of the two sets of questionnaires.

# CHAPTER IV

# SOLUTION STRATEGY

## Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

A systematic, valuable field experience procedure needed to be identified and implemented for students in an Introduction to Early Childhood Education course. The amount of interaction among the four personnel components (field experience students, cooperating teachers, instructor/supervisor, and college leadership) was minimal and loosely coordinated. The result was a mediocre field experience for students in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course.

According to Goodman (1986), just placing students in a field experience site classroom does not automatically promote professional growth. If field experience is a valued component of the class, students need to be trained in observation and recording procedures (Bonar, 1985). They also need to comprehend the relationship between observed on-site happenings and theories presented in the college classroom. Applegate (1985), Bonar (1985), Erdman (1983), Fagan and Merchant (1984), address this issue with one primary strategy, journal writing. This "log-keeping" provides for student assimilation and debriefing (Bonar). Student writing, says Erdman (1983), requires juxtaposing new information with existing knowledge to form new concepts and connections about theory and reality. Learning in this manner is likely to frustrate students because their

insights are just beginning to emerge; the student is typically inexperienced at introspection; and some may have difficulty expressing these new ideas on paper (Byrd & Garofalo, 1982). Furthermore, students can also experience difficulty remembering specifics for log content unless writing takes place immediately following observation (Byrd & Garofalo). Nevertheless, Applegate, Bonar, Erdman, Fannagan and Merchant all proclaim the value of logging field experience observations as a means of reflective thinking. And, according to Rust (1988), this type of writing also done by the instructor/supervisor enhances the clarification and analysis cycle.

The reflective thinking process should be a verbal experience as well as a written one (Applegate, 1985; Byrd & Garofalo, 1982; Goodman, 1986). Without guided reflection of these field experiences, students "may be left accepting all teaching behaviors as valid" and all child behavior as normal (Applegate, 1985, p. 61). Armaline and Hoover (1989), Cunningham, et al. (1983-1984), and Goodman (1986) also endorse the "habit of reflection", suggesting that techniques, relationships between educational principles and practice, ethical concerns, and values clarification be a part of the college classroom decision.

To inform cooperating teachers of the goals and expectations of the program, Applegate (1982), Bonar (1985), and Goodman (1988) call for a systematic training as well as orientation for these teachers. These sessions will define the program and "enable the cooperating teachers to know what they are expected to do and why they are expected to do it"

(Applegate, 1982, p. 61). In fact, the triad of cooperating teacher, field experience student, and instructor/supervisor collaborating to design the program is recommended by Bonar (1985) and Rust (1988). Applegate (1985), Korinek (1989), McIntyre and Killian (1987) and Lasley, Applegate, and Ellison (1986) all say communication of expectations and needs and coordination with classroom agenda are essential to an effective field experience program. Better training of cooperating teachers will increase the capacity of these professionals to model behaviors and organize activities deemed essential for field experience students (Lasley, et al., 1986). Also, when these sessions are conducted by the field experience supervisor, the demands and constraints felt by cooperating teachers and site supervisors are revealed (Erdman, 1983).

Goodman (1986) reports of Washburn University's programmed, regular instructor/supervisor visits to field experience sites where individual concerns can be adressed. This procedure concurs with Byrd and Garofala's belief that the instructor/supervisor, adopting the attitude of learner and guest at the field experience site, will build the necessary rapport and mutual respect with cooperating teachers (Byrd and Garofalo, 1982). Using tools such as supervisory journals and frequent conferences continues to facilitate the desired relationship between college and site personnel (Rust, 1988). In a well-planned program a comprehensive handbook guides the cooperating teacher and field experience student through the field experience process (Goodman, 1986). So, regular site visits, conferences,

journal writing, and use of a field experience handbook are recommended to enhance field experience quality.

Authors concerned with field experience issues also point to solutions by management of logistics and by interaction with other collegiate personnel. To clarify intent, the instructor/supervisor needs to identify values and organizational arrangements necessary to complete the mission and challenge decision-makers to implement needed action (Goodman, 1988). One of these actions may be to request college compensation for supervision time (Applegate, 1985; Lasley, Applegate, & Ellison, 1986). One means for facilitating reform is the establishment of a collegiate faculty field experience committee to share concerns and issues and unite toward a common cause (deLaski-Smith and Hansen, 1983). Provided by deLaski-Smith and Hansen (1983) are tips for operational materials (logs, weekly performance sheets, checklists, and self evaluations). O'Shea, Hoover, and Carroll (1988) exhort supervisors to prioritize time for goal-setting and carrying out these goals including observations and conferences.

Many of these strategies were applied to this writer's situation. More emphasis on integrating field experience with course/text content was possible with instructor/supervisor revision of lesson plans and teaching strategies. Both verbal and written reflective thinking activities were incorporated in campus class sessions. Communication between instructor/supervisor and on-site personnel was enhanced with instructor/supervisor prioritization of time. A more detailed and informative exchange of information was

addressed through a well-planned orientation system. The site visits promoted by Goodman (1986) and Byrd and Garolaffa (1982), were implemented.

The working relationship of this writer with the one and only other early childhood faculty person of this small college is one of continual communication and rapport, therefore the field experience committee comprised of college faculty as suggested by deLaski-Smith and Hansen (1983) was not applicable. However, this concept taken with Bonar (1985) and Rust's (1988) suggestion of triad collaboration, led to the formation of a field experience committee (See Figure 3).

Using a number of the tools recommended by these authors faciliated the new field experience process. These tools included logs, field experience guidebook, and checklists. Adopting a number of these solution recommendations, adapting others to fit the writer's work setting, and soliciting input from persons involved at the writer's locale provided impetus for solution strategies.

## Description of Selected Solution

The solution strategies selected to remedy the problem include a number of steps by the instructor/supervisor to provide a coordinated, quality field experience for the students in the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course. Presented here is a stated solution with its coordinating rationale.

1. On-Site Visits by Instructor-Supervisor. The instructor/supervisor made two on-site visits with each field experience student and coordinating teacher. This action implemented Goodman's (1986) recommendation for allowing the instructor/supervisor to be more informed and responsive to cooperating teacher and student needs as they occur. Furthermore, according to Byrd and Garofala (1982), the supervisor as learner and guest at the field experience site offers mutual rapport and insight for productive interaction.

2. Student Logs. Applegate (1985) and others speak of "log-keeping" to develop student skills in interpreting on-site experiences. This writer adopted the concept of classroom journal writing as well as regular written observational responses pertinent to field experiences.

3. Campus Class Agenda. Class sessions taught by the instructor/supervisor were designed to include collaboration with students about field experience happenings and to offer fifteen minutes during each class session to make reflective log entries. This concept promoted by Armaline and Hoover (1989) and others was planned for students to see relationships between educational concepts and practice.

4. Orientations. Following the advice of Bonar (1985), McIntyre and Killian (1987), and Rust (1988),

orientation sessions were used. One of the three orientations was held in the campus classroom, briefing students about college expectations of students while at the field experience site. The second was the instructor/supervisor's orientation of cooperating teachers and site administrators. The third was that of cooperating teachers and/or site administrators with field experience students.

5. Field Experience Handbook. The instructor/supervisor developed a field experience handbook as part of the total renovated field experience process. Input from the field experience committee, other college personnel and review of other course field experience handbooks were combined to produce this tool. This systematic, written presentation, as Goodman (1986) suggests, provided all involved with information about each others' needs and expectations.

6. Cooperating Teacher Report Form. Adapting the tips for operational materials from deLaski-Smith and Hansen (1983), the instructor/supervisor implemented a cooperating teacher report form to assist cooperating teachers in giving feedback about students' field experience actions. Input from the field experience committee was considered in constructing the final version of this form.

7. Instructor/supervisor Log. Rust (1988) mentions

that a log maintained by the instructor/supervisor can facilitate desired relationships with students and on-site staff. Therefore, the author proposed to keep a log divided into two sections, one to reflect upon classroom integration of field experiences and the other to document details about each on-site field experience visit made by instructor/supervisor.

Basic conditions allowed for change. The author's time schedule could be altered to allow time needed. Previous experience teaching this course facilitated the interaction plan. The writer's rapport with on-site personnel, college faculty and staff was intact. The stage was set for developing and implementing a qualtiy field experience for the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course students.

## Report of Action Taken

Following is a summary of the practicum steps taken:

1. Needs, recommendations, and plans for change were shared in conversation and written form with College Education Department chairperson. Acceptance and compensation for time and work were provided.

2. Field Experience Handbook was designed and printed.

3. Questionnaires were designed and distributed to FES and CT/Administrators of previous field experience. Although 67 students originally enrolled in this previous class/field experience, two withdrew, thus, 65 student questionnaires were distributed. Thirty-five students responded. Of the 29 CT/Administrators, 24 could be reached with 20 respondents.

4. The first field experience committee was selected and met prior to implementing the practicum.

5. Class agenda was outlined to include I/S orientation of students to field experience--expectations, procedures, and requirements. Guidelines for student logs were prepared. Lesson plans were made to integrate student field experiences with text information and other facts presented by I/S.

6. Arrangements were made for I/S orientation of CT/Administrators and for CT/Administrators' orientation of FES.

7. Students were assigned field experience sites by I/S. Each student weekly participated at assigned

site. The I/S desired to make requirement of 20 hours total field experience as stated previously, but to satisfy standards to which the College Education Department was already committed, the required number of hours was 30. Therefore, each student completed 30 hours of on-site field experience.

While on site, FES and CT kept records using Cooperating Teacher Report Form.

8. I/S visited each FES and CT on site two times during the course. Two of the 32 students were visited only one time due to illness and schedule changes.

9. College class sessions included integration of field experiences with text and other information; some class sessions included log-writing.

10. At the conclusion of the course questionnaires were distributed and gathered from FES and CT/Administrators. CT turned in the Cooperating Teacher Report Form to I/S and the field experience committee met a second time.

# CHAPTER V

# RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Results

The goal of this practicum was that students in Introduction to Early Childhood Education would participate in a coordinated, quality field experience. Through implementation of the process steps, it was anticipated that at least ten of the possible twelve outcome standards would be carried out. Seventeen of the twenty-one achievement criteria were expected to be accomplished. Review of questionnaire data from FES and CT/Administrators would reveal similarities and changes regarding the previous field experience process and the new, practicum field experience process.

The process steps were implemented in the basic sequence planned with a few variations made to work more efficiently toward the ultimate goal. An example of one such change was the meeting time of the first field experience committee. Holding the first field experience committee meeting after the first questionnaires were returned (rather than before their return as scheduled) provided a broader information base for participants. The orientation of cooperating teachers by the instructor/supervisor was conducted later than originally scheduled to take advantage of the college Education Department Chairperson's invitation to make this a part of the total college field experience orientation dinner. This new date was timely enough and enhanced the early childhood sector's linkage with the elementary and

secondary education program. Hence, the basic organized plan for implementing the practicum was activated and in the few instances where change of sequence was necessary, the outcome was improved by that change.

**Table 2**

**Outcomes Assessment**

| Outcome Standard | Standard: F = Fully met, P = Partially met, N = Not met |
|---|---|
| 1. FES observed and interacted in an early childhood program. | 1. F |
| 2. Each FES verbally expressed to CT and I/S happenings, questions, and insights about the field experience. | 2. F |
| 3. Each FES wrote about observations, concerns, and insights of field experiences. | 3. F |
| 4. Each CT and site administrator had knowledge of needs and expectations of FES and I/S, including college course goals. | 4. F |
| 5. Each CT communicated own needs, expectations, happenings, and concerns regarding field experience to I/S during the process. | 5. F |
| 6. I/S gained knowledge about needs, concerns, and strengths of field experience program as perceived by CT, FES and site program administrators. | 6. F |
| 7. I/S selected respresentative group of FES, CT, and site administrators to form a field experience committee which met with I/S to share perspectives about field experience and develop unity and rapport. | 7. P |
| 8. I/S developed a printed field experience handbook tailored to the course. This handbook was distributed and explained to all FES, CT, and site administrators. | 8. F |

(table continues)

**Table 2**

**Outcomes Assessment**

| Outcome Standard | Standard: F = Fully met P = Partially met N = Not met |
|---|---|
| 9. I/S conducted two field experience orientation sessions, one for CT and site administrators and the other for FES. | 9. F |
| 10. I/S arranged for session in which site administrators and/or CT oriented FES to their respective sites just prior to FES first on-site participation time. | 10. F |
| 11. I/S made on-site visits with FES and CT. | 11. P |
| 12. Decision-making college personnel recognized time and energies needed for quality field experience component of course and offered compensation to facilitate such. | 12. F |

The Outcomes Assessment of Table 2 shows ten of the twelve standards were fully met and two were partially met. Regarding the field experience committee (Standard 7), the original standard stated that a total of eight persons (three FES, three CT, and two site program administrators) would be committee participants. The instructor/supervisor had confirmations of these eight persons, but two of these eight persons had emergencies and were unable to attend. However, since these emergencies were not known until shortly before the meeting time and all three components (FES, CT, and administrators) were still represented, the decision was made to hold the meeting with these six. For the second committee meeting, all eight persons were present.

Standard 9 was that the I/S would make two on-site visits with each FES and CT. This was completed with 30 of the 32 students. Illness and schedule complications prevented a second visit with the remaining two students. The I/S did converse with each of the CT a second time and held a personal off-site conversation with each of these two students regarding the field experience.

The results of the practicum can also be viewed by the number of Standards of Achievement met as displayed in Table 3.

**Table 3**

**Standards of Achievement Assessment**

| Standard of Achievement | Standard: F = Fully met P = Partially met N = Not met |
|---|---|
| 1. Each FES followed a written schedule for minimum of two hours weekly field experience for a minimum of ten weeks. | 1. F |
| 2. Each week each FES wrote an entry in own log. | 2. P |
| 3. Each CT documented FES participation weekly and presented to I/S at end of course. | 3. F |
| 4. Documentation of FES stated verbal expressions appeared on CT report form. | 4. F |
| 5. For each FES, the I/S log showed two recordings of verbal communication with I/S | 5. F |
| 6. All FES questionnaires revealed at least two incidents of verbal communication with CT regarding field experience. | 6. F |

(table continues)

Table 3

Standards of Achievement Assessment

| Standard of Achievement | Standard: F = Fully met P = Partially met N = Not met |
|---|---|
| 7. Each FES log contained a minimum of two incidents of verbal communication about field experience. | 7. F |
| 8. Each FES weekly recorded observations, concerns, and insights in log. | 8. P |
| 9. CT reported knowledge of needs and expectations. | 9. F |
| 10. I/S log referred to at least one instance of CT communication with each other as stated. | 10. F |
| 11. All CT state that I/S made at least one one-site communication. | 11. F |
| 12. Five out of every ten questionnaires distributed to last school year persons were completed and returned. | 12. F |
| 13. Seven out of every ten questionnaires distributed to this school year persons were completed and returned. | 13. F |
| 14. A total of eight persons (three FES, three CT, and two site program administrators) met two times with I/S, conversing about field experience program as stated. One of these occurred in the formative state of the project and one occurred at close of the project. | 14. P |
| 15. All FES, CT, and site administrators had a field experience handbook. | 15. F |
| 16. All CT and FES reported knowledge of handbook and implemented it. | 16. F |

(table continues)

Table 3

Standards of Achievement Assessment

| Standard of Achievement | Standard: F = Fully met P = Partially met N = Not met |
|---|---|
| 17. CT and site administrators attended orientation session. (I/S met separately with whoever could not attend.) | 17. F |
| 18. FES attended campus class orientation session. (I/S communicated separately with whoever could not attend.) | 18. F |
| 19. Site administrators or CT presented copy of completed orientation agenda to I/S. | 19. F |
| 20. I/S made a minimum of two on-site visits to each FES during the course/practicum time. | 20. P |
| 21. College offered I/S contractual agreement which included compensation for facilitating field experience component of course. | 21. F |

Four standards were partially met and seventeen standards fully met, as Table 3 shows. Weekly FES log writing including observations, concerns, and insights (Standards 2 and 8) was included in only eight of the fifteen college class sessions. This transpired because other necessary agenda was more appropriate at such times as the three beginning classes where explaining requirements and field experience orientation took precedent. At other times the value of the present class discussion preempted the

planned log writing and finally, two sessions were exam times. Standards 14 and 18 are similar to those outcomes reviewed in Table 2.

Standards 13 and 21 were fully met, even beyond the writer's expectations. All questionnaires given to this year's persons were returned completed. This included 32 out of 32 FES questionnaires and 15 out of 15 CT/administrator questionnaires. In addition to providing financial compensation for the field experience component of this course (Standard 21), college personnel rearranged the course schedule, placing one section in the fall term and the other section in the spring term. So, the total number of FES for Introduction to Early Childhood education in any one semester was approximately half what it had been. This schedule allowed the time needed for on-site visits by the I/S.

The data from questionnaires distributed to FES and CT/Administrators who were part of the field experience process as it was previously managed and information from questionnaires distributed to FES and CT/Administrators who were involved in the new field experience process are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Field Experience Student (FES) Questionnaire Responses

| Questionnaire Item | Previous Process (n = 35)[a] | New Process (n = 32)[b] |
|---|---|---|
| Before FES had first field experience for course, FES | | |
| ...was told by course instructor what to expect | 24 | 26 |
| ...was told by site administrator or teacher what to expect | 21 | 15 |
| ...was not informed by anyone about what to expect | 1 | 3 |
| ... other | 2 | 1 |
| While at the field experience, FES talked with cooperating teacher | | |
| ...every time FES was there | 29 | 24 |
| ...more than half the time FES was there | 4 | 6 |
| ...less than half the time FES was there | 0 | 2 |
| ...no time I was there | 0 | 0 |
| The course instructor/ Supervisor visited FES while at field experience site | | |
| ...0 times | 32 | 0 |
| ...1 time | 1 | 2 |
| ...2 times | 1 | 28 |
| ...more than 2 times | 1 | 2 |

(table continues)

Table 4

Field Experience Student (FES) Questionnaire Responses

| Questionnaire Item | Previous Process (n = 35) [a] | New Process (n = 32) [b] |
|---|---|---|
| The college classroom presentations and discussions | | |
| ...frequently mentioned field experiences | 24 | 24 |
| ...sometimes mentioned field experiences | 11 | 8 |
| ...never mentioned field experiences | 0 | 0 |
| FES student expected CT to (checked as many as applied) | | |
| ...let FES observe rather than participate | 5 | 8 |
| ...tell FES about the daily routine | 32 | 28 |
| ...give FES a specific task with children each time FES visits | 29 | 20 |
| ...tell FES what to expect from children | 23 | 16 |
| ...tell FES how to handle specific situations | 33 | 28 |

[a] and [b]. Note that number of responses are not parallel and that the number 35 of previous process responses represents the 35 returned questionnaires out of the 65 distributed. On the other hand, the number 32 of new process responses represents all of the questionnaires distributed. Also to be observed is the fact that since the same students do not take the course twice, those FES answering the questionnaire referring to the previous process were not the same persons as those answering the questionnaire referring to the new process. Therefore, conclusions drawn from this data are limited and tentative.

Review of this data shows that information about what FES could expect at the field experience was considered communicated by most students in both the previous and new processes. Likewise, in both the previous and new processes the FES and CT communicated nearly everytime the field experience visit took place. The number of times FES students said that college classroom presentations/ discussions mentioned field experiences was similar in both the previous and new processes. In addition, FES expectations of CT were nearly alike for both groups of FES.

The area of striking difference was in the number of times the instructor/supervisor visited the FES while at the field experience site. In the previous process 32 of the 35 respondents stated that no visits had been made. An interesting note is that although the I/S made no official on-site visits with students in the former field experience, three stated that the I/S had done so. Perhaps these students observed the I/S in conversation with the administrator on site, thereby determining that a visit had been made. In the new process 28 of 32 respondents noted the I/S visited two times, two FES stated that I/S visited once, and two stated that I/S visited more than two times.

The CT/Administrator questionnaire responses shown in Tables 5 and 6 verified the difference in number of contacts the I/S made on-site. Referring to the previous process, 10 of the 20 respondents stated that I/S had made no contact, 3 said one contact had been made, one mentioned 2 contacts, and 7 respondents stated 3 contacts. During the previous process, the I/S did visit the campus preschool on occasion

Table 5

**Questionnaire Responses (n = 20) from Cooperating Teacher/Site Administrators Referring to Previous Field Experience Process**

| Questionnaire Item | | Number of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| HOW WAS IT? | | |
| Number of times I/S contacted CT/A while student(s) did field experience in classroom/center [a] | | |
| | 0 time | 10 |
| | 1 time | 3 |
| | 2 times | 1 |
| | 3 or more times | 7 |
| Number of times CT/A contacted I/S while student(s) did field experience in classroom/center | | |
| | 0 time | 9 |
| | 1 time | 4 |
| | 2 times | 3 |
| | 3 or more times | 3 |
| The method of these contacts for any of the above (checked as many as applied) | | |
| | In person on site | 8 |
| | Via phone at site | 6 |
| | Brief written response form | 0 |
| | Other | 2 |
| | No contact made | 7 |
| The purposes of these contacts included...(checked as many as applied) | | |
| | Making arrangements for placing students | 6 |
| | Explaining expectations/process | 6 |
| | Discussion progress/needs of students | 6 |
| | Other | 2 |
| | Not applicable/no contact made | 6 |

(table continues)

Table 5

**Questionnaire Responses (n = 20) from Cooperating Teacher/Site Administrators Referring to Previous Field Experience Process**

| Questionnaire Item | Number of Responses |
|---|---|
| WHAT WOULD MAKE IT BETTER? | |
| CT/A would like contact/communication with I/S more than in the past | |
| Yes | 17 |
| No | 3 |
| Those stating yes desired these contacts to be made [b] | |
| 1 time while student involved in field experience | 3 |
| 2 times while student involved in field experience | 12 |
| More than 2 times while student involved in field experience | 6 |
| CT/A preferred this contact/communication to be made...(check as many as applied) | |
| In person on site | 13 |
| Via phone on site | 12 |
| With brief written response form | 1 |
| Other | 0 |
| The purpose for which CT/A wanted these contacts included ...(checked as many as applied) | |
| Making arrangements for student placements | 7 |
| Explaining purpose/program of field experience | 12 |
| Discussing progress/needs of student(s) | 16 |
| Other | 1 |
| CT/A expect field experience student to...(checked as many as applied) | |
| Be punctual | 20 |
| Call when unable to keep appointment | 20 |
| Observe rather than participate | 1 |
| Interact with the children | 19 |
| Take initiative | 18 |
| Carry out specific tasks with children | 13 |
| Dress professionally | 16 |
| Other | 1 |

[a] and [b] . Respondents made two responses.

Table 6

Questionnaire Responses (n = 15) from Cooperating Teacher/Site Administrators Referring to New Field Experience Process

| Questionnaire Item | Number of Responses |
|---|---|
| HOW WAS IT? | |
| Number of times I/S contacted CT/A while student(s) did field experience in classroom/center | |
| 0 time | 0 |
| 1 time | 0 |
| 2 times | 2 |
| 3 or more times | 13 |
| Number of times CT/A contacted I/S while student(s) did field experience in classroom/center | |
| 0 time | 12 |
| 1 time | 0 |
| 2 times | 1 |
| 3 or more times | 1 |
| The method of these contacts for any of the above (checked as many as applied) | |
| In person on site | 13 |
| Via phone at site | 3 |
| Brief written response form | 0 |
| Other | 0 |
| No contact made | 2 |
| The purposes of these contacts included...(checked as many as applied) | |
| Making arrangements for placing students | 5 |
| Explaining expectations/process | 7 |
| Discussing progress/needs of students | 13 |
| Other | 0 |
| Not applicable/no contact made | 2 |

(table continues)

Table 6

**Questionnaire Responses (n = 15) from Cooperating Teacher/Site Administrators Referring to New Field Experience Process**

| Questionnaire Item | Number of Responses |
|---|---|
| WHAT WOULD MAKE IT BETTER? | |
| CT/A would like contact/communication with I/S more than in the past | |
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 13 |
| Those stating yes desired these contacts to be made | |
| 1 time while student involved in field experience | 0 |
| 2 times while student involved in field experience | 5 |
| More than 2 times while student involved in field experience | 1 |
| CT/A preferred this contact/communication to be made...(checked as many as applied) | |
| In person on site | 9 |
| Via phone on site | 0 |
| With brief written response form | 0 |
| Other | 0 |
| The purpose for which CT/A wanted these contacts included... (checked as many as applied) | |
| Making arrangements for student placements | 4 |
| Explaining purpose/program of field experience | 5 |
| Discussing progress/needs of student(s) | 9 |
| Other | 0 |
| CT/A expect field experience student to...(checked as many as applied) | |
| Be punctual | 15 |
| Call when unable to keep appointment | 15 |
| Observe rather than participate | 3 |
| Interact with the children | 15 |
| Take initiative | 14 |
| Carry out specific tasks with children | 14 |
| Dress professionally | 9 |
| Other | 2 |

for conferences with C/T regarding student teachers and other work which some CT/Administrators may have interpreted as I/S field experience visits. Of the 15 respondents after the new process, no one mentioned 0 or 1 contact, 2 said 2 contacts were made and 13 said 3 or more contacts were made. Eight of the cooperating teachers had more than 1 FES assigned to their classrooms at different times during the week which may be the reason some of the 13 referred to more than 3 contacts made by I/S.

Both before and after the new process, most CT/Administrators took little or no initiative to contact I/S. The contacts which were initiated were done on site in both the previous and new processes.

Referring to the previous process (Table 5), CT/Administrators mentioned an even number of times that the purposes of these contacts to be for all three reasons: for making placement arrangements, for explaining expectations and process, and for discussing progress/needs of specific students. But the emphasis for those in the new process (Table 6) was that of discussing progress/needs of specific students (13 out of 15 responses). Making arrangements for placing students received 5 marks from the 15 replies, and explaining expectations and process received 7 marks from the 15 responses.

A distinct difference in the previous and new process CT/Administrator questionnaire answers was in the area of "what would make it better". Referring to the previous process, 17 of the 20 respondents stated that they would like contact/communication with instructor more than in the past.

Of those replying to the new process, only 1 of 15 stated that more contact/communication with instructor was desired.

The CT/Administrator expectations of FES were basically the same for both groups. Students were expected to be punctual, call when uable to keep appointment, interact with children, take initiative, carry out specific tasks, and dress professionally. FES participation rather than observation was preferred by a majority of the respondents.

In summation of questionnaire data, FES and CT/Administrators documented a definite increase in I/S contacts with them at the field experience site. Furthermore, CT/Administrators referring to the previous process, desired more I/S contact; and the CT/Administrators responding to the new process expressed satisfaction with the amount of I/S contact. In the areas of identifying and communicating expectations, FES and CT/Administrators provided similar responses both before and after the new field experience process.

An overview of the results shows that the field experience process steps were implemented, ten of the twelve outcome standards were fulfilled, seventeen of twenty-one achievement criteria were met, and questionnaire responses verify field experience process changes. A cooperating teacher says it this way: "The program ran very smoothly. I attribute that to the changes made this year."

## Discussion

One of the most valuable components of the new field experience process was that of on-site visits by the I/S. The ability to see the individuality of each setting offered a deeper understanding of what each student was experiencing and gave specific reference examples for the college class agenda. These interactions also provided opportunity for giving encouragement as well as asking and answering questions. As the communicated expectations were being met, the FES, CT/Administrators, and I/S shared a feeling of camaraderie.

The student logs offered some reflective analysis for students and insights to I/S. However, since the students complete an observation of specific focus for each field experience (See Field Experience Report Forms listed in Appendix G.), these writings are supplemental rather than primary to the student's understanding and integration of the field experience.

The campus class agenda did include collaboration with students about field experience happenings. Yet, according to FES questionnaire responses from the previous process and the new process, very little changed. The majority of both groups stated that classroom presentations and discussions frequently mentioned field experiences.

The added orientation of CT/Administrators by I/S proved helpful. Personally informing the on-site staff of college purposes and policies and sharing the typical FES apprehensions and needs assisted in forming a common understanding and anticipation. This setting encouraged exchange of potential concerns so they could be addressed in a rational manner with

the mission of the program in mind.

A reinforcement of the information exchange was made possible with the Field Experience Handbook developed by the I/S (Appendix G). This written document given to all FES and CT/Administrators was a ready reference used as a base for orientation of FES and CT/Administrators.

The Cooperating Teacher Report Form verified each FES participation and the communication between CT and FES. It documented the anticipated verbal interaction as well.

As each on-site visit was made, the I/S logged data regarding date, time, place, activities of FES observed, and topics of conversation with FES and CT. Periodically during log-writing time in the college classroom, I/S logged reflections of program progress.

Of the seven major field experience components stated above, the on-site visits, the Field Experience Handbook, and the CT/Administrator orientation proved to be the most effective.

## Recommendations

Four recommendations seem appropriate. Two of these ideas generated from the second field experience committee meeting; the other two are original suggestions of the I/S. First, since students are placed in a variety of settings including the public school kindergarten as well as preschool and child care programs, the I/S could adapt the classroom agenda and more frequently point out text sections pertinent to

these more structured public school environments. Secondly, FES and CT/Administrators of the committee suggested that the last one or two FES on-site visits be arranged so that FES could visit other classrooms to observe the variety and uniqueness of each group. As a third recommendation, the I/S advocates that log-writing in approximately half of the college classroom sessions is adequate and should be the criteria rather than log-writing every session as originally planned. The final suggestion is that at revision time of the Field Experience Handbook, a section entitled "What to Expect When the Instructor/Supervisor Comes to Visit" be added. This could include such specifics as: The I/S will stay approximately 30 minutes, will converse briefly with FES and CT/Administrator, and will verify FES participation. It will convey the fact that the I/S is there, not to critique, but to be a supportive team member. In addition, the Cooperating Teacher Report Form could be redesigned with a brief checklist of experiences and traits the CT observed of the FES while on site.

## Dissemination

The successful outcomes have been shared with the field experience committee. In the near future, a written, one-page summary of the results accompanied with a note of appreciation will be sent by the writer to the Chairperson of the Education Department and to the College Provost. These persons were instrumental in college decisions of class schedule changes, for including this field experience orientation with

the other college course orientations dinner meeting, and for offering financial compensation for the time and effort of this endeavor.

A natural and informal dissemination process evolves with the community and on-the-job professionals in the early childhood education/care field as the instructor/ supervisor makes on-site visits. As placement of field experience students occurs in different settings, the opportunity for communication, knowledge, and involvement broadens. The horizons extend to sharing with other college faculty at professional gatherings as well.

The time and effort in planning and implementing this practicum has benefited all involved. The cooperating teachers are more informed about the college agenda and student issues. Through this process, the instructor/ supervisor is better equipped to meet student and cooperating teacher needs. The result is that the students in Introduction to Early Childhood Education do participate in a coordinated, quality field experience.

## References

Applegate, J.H. (1985). Early field experiences: Recurring dilemmas. Journal of Teacher Education 36 (2), 60-64.

Applegate, J.H. & Lasley, T.J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. Journal of Teacher Education 33(2), 15-18.

Armaline, W.P. & Hoover, R.L. (1989). Field experience as a vehicle for trnsformation: Ideology, education, and reflective practice. Journal of Teacher Education 40(2), 42-28.

Bonar, B. (1985). Needed: Structured activities in early field experience programs. Action in Teacher Education, 7(3), 43-47.

Byrd, P. & Garofalo, J. (1982). Issues in conducting a pre-student teaching field experience. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15, 45-52.

Calderhead, J. (1988). Learning from introductory school experience. Journal of Education for Teaching, 14 (1), 75-83.

Cohn, M.M. & Gillman, V.C. (1988). Supervision: A developmental approach for fostering inquiry in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 39(2), 3-7.

Cunningham, G. S., Bower, W.S., & McGhee, P.R. (1983-1984). Developing observational skills in early field experiences. Teacher Education, 19(3), 2-10.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

de-Laski-Smith, D. & Hansen, J. (1983). A new approach to field experience. Journal of Home Economics, 75(1), 38-44.

Erdman, J.I. (1983). Assessing the purposes of early field experience programs. Journal of Teacher Education 34 (4), 27-31.

Fagan, E.R. and Merchant, L.J. (1984). A priority assessment of pre-service teachers' field experience activities. Clearing House 57, 374-377.

Faria, G., Brownstein, C. & SMith, H. Y. (1988). A survey of field instructors' perceptions of the liaison role. Journal of Social Work Education 24(2), 135-144.

Goodman, J. (1985). What students learn from early field experiences: A case study and critical analysis. Journal of Teacher Education,36 (2) 42-48.

Goodman, J. (1986). Making early field experience meaningful: A critical approach. Journal of Education for Teaching 12(2), 109-125.

Goodman, J. (1988). University culture and the problem of reforming field experiences in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(5), 45-53.

Katz, L.G. (1982). The education of preprimary teachers Manuscript submitted for publication.

Korinek, L.A. (1989). Teacher preference for training and competence for field supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 40,(6), 46-51.

Lasley, T.J., Applegate, J.H., & Ellison, C. (1986). The expectations and problems of university supervisors of early field experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching, 12(2), 127-140.

McIntyre, D.J., & Killian, J.E. (1986). Students' interactions with pupils and cooperating teachers in early field experiences. Teacher Education, 22(2), 2-9.

McIntyre, D.J. & Killian, J.E. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on preservice teacher's development during early field experiences. Journal of Educational Research, 80 (5), 277-282.

O'Shea, L.J., Hoover, N.L., & Carroll, R.G. (1988). Effective intern conferencing. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 17-21.

Rust, F.O. (1988). How Supervisors think about teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 56-63.

Simmons, J.S. (1989). Who should supervise the field experience? English Education, 21, 182-186.

Spodek, B. & Davis, M. (1982). A study of programs to prepare early childhood personnel. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 42-44.

# APPENDIX A

# LETTER STATING COURSE OBJECTIVES

Date

Dear (administrator),

Thank you for sharing your center with our _____ students for field experience in Education 101: Introduction to Early Childhood Education. Our purpose is to offer students opportunity to:

(1) Observe child behavior and development.
(2) Witness professional teacher/child interaction.
(3) Note the elements of a developmentally appropriate environment and program.
(4) Interact with young children for first-hand understanding of child behavior.

To carry out these objectives, _____ expects these students to:

(1) Participate 2 hours weekly at your center. Students are to keep a running, current record of the specific dates/times they participate.

(2) Interact professionally with you, your staff, and your children.

(a) In your orientation with the studerts, your communication to them about specific professional expectations will be helpful. Example: Positive guidance techniques, their need to be punctual, dependable, ask appropriate questions and dress appropriately. (_____ urges wearing slacks rather than jeans.)

(b) One of our first _____ class session deals with the traits of a professional. We want these to mesh with your expectations.

(3) Complete a Field Experience Observation Form for weekly _____ class assignment.

To enhance the experience and make it the best it can be, _____ asks your staff/center to:

(1) Orient the students as to your specific expectations of them.

(2) Answer questions sudents may have during this experience regarding procedures/policies.

(3) Be a professional model for students.

(4) Allow students to observe/participate with your regular staff.

(5) Freely communicate with me (phone _____ ) with any questions, concerns, or problems that may arise regarding procedures or a specific situation.

We look forward to a mutually satisfying experience for all and are committed to the time, effort, and interaction to make it so.

Sincerely,

Maxine Burgett
Instructor
Education 101

MB/mb

## APPENDIX B

## COOPERATING TEACHER REPORT FORM

# COOPERATING TEACHER REPORT FORM

Student Name _____ Site Name _____

Day Attending _____ Time _____ to _____

| Attendance date | Topic of discussion w/student |
|---|---|
| Week 1: | |
| Week 2: | |
| Week 3: | |
| Week 4: | |
| Week 5: | |
| Week 6: | |
| Week 7: | |
| Week 8: | |
| Week 9: | |
| Week 10: | |

COMMENTS REGARDING STUDENT'S PERFORMANCE AND PERSONAL QUALITIES

_____

_____

I received a field experience handbook. Yes___ No___

I was able to implement the plans outlined in the field experience handbook. Yes___ No___

I received information about the needs and expectations of...

- field experience students. Yes___ No___
- instructor/supervisor Yes___ No___
- college/course goals Yes___ No___

Date completed_____ Cooperating Teacher _____

# APPENDIX C

## FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

June 1991

Dear Student,

Last fall you participated in the field experiences of the Introduction to Early Childhood education course. I trust that it was a meaningful adventure for you. We at _____ strive to make this involvement the best it can be, and for that reason we look to you to give us feedback about how it was and what you need and expect from experiences such as these.

The brief time you spend to respond to this questionnaire can make a big impact on the quality of field experiences for future students. Your responses will be kept confidential and will help in planning the Fall 1991 field experience process.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire by July 8 and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed. I will be pleased to send you a copy of the survey results if you desire.

Sincerely,

Maxine Burgett

MB/mb

## FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Place an X in the blank to the left of each item which indicates your response.

1. Before I had my first field experience for the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course I...
   ____ a. was told by course instructor what to expect.
   ____ b. was told by site administrator or teacher what to expect.
   ____ c. was not informed by anyone about what to expect
   ____ d. Other _____

2. While at my field experience, I talked with my cooperating teacher...
   ____ a. every time I was there.
   ____ b. more than half the time I was there.
   ____ c. less than half the time I was there.
   ____ d. no time I was there.

3. The course instructor/supervisor visited me while at the field experience site...
   ____ a. 0 times
   ____ b. 1 time
   ____ c. 2 times
   ____ d. more than 2 times

4. The college classroom presentations and discussions...
   ____ a. frequently mentioned field experiences.
   ____ b. sometimes mentioned field experiences.
   ____ c. never mentioned field experiences.

5. I expect a field experience cooperating teacher to... Check all that apply.
   ____ a. let me observe rather than participate
   ____ b. tell me about the daily routine
   ____ c. give me a specific task with children each time I visit
   ____ d. tell me what to expect from the children
   ____ e. tell me how to handle specific situations as they occur (i.e. how to assist at art table, bathroom procedure, guiding child behavior)

6. Other things I would like a cooperating teacher to do are...
   _____
   _____

7. The things that would improve the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course and its field experiences are...
   _____
   _____

# APPENDIX D

## COOPERATING TEACHER/SITE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

June 1991

Dear Early Childhood Educator,

Putting college students in contact with everyday early childhood activities is a vital part of _____ Introduction to Early Childhood Education course. I appreciate your past participation in the field experience portion of this program. As we at _____ strive to make this involvement the best it can be, we look to your expertise and feedback. For this reason I ask you to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

We realize the need to know your expectations and concerns. The brief time you spend to respond can make a big impact toward the goal of a coordinated, quality field experience for these students. Your responses will be kept confidential and will help in planning the Fall 1991 field experience.

It will be appreciated if you complete the enclosed questionnaire by July 8 and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed. I will be pleased to send you a copy of the survey results if you desire.

Sincerely,

Maxine Burgett

MB/mb

## COOPERATING TEACHER/SITE ADMINISTRATOR

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Place an X in the blank to the left of each item which indicates your response.

I. POSITION. Your role in your early childhood program is...

____ a. teacher
____ b. assistant teacher
____ c. administrator
____ d. other Please state _____

II. HOW WAS IT? Referring to Fall 1990...

A. The number of times the instructor of _____ Introduction to Early Childhood Education class contacted you while student(s) did field experience in your classroom/center was:

____ a. 0
____ b. 1
____ c. 2
____ d. 3 or more

B. The number of times you contacted instructor of _____ Introduction to Early Childhood Education class while student(s) did field experience in your classroom/center was:

____ a. 0
____ b. 1
____ c. 2
____ d. 3 or more

C. The method of these contacts for any of the above was...(Check as many as apply.)

____ a. in person on site
____ b. via phone at site
____ c. brief written response form
____ d. other Please state _____
____ e. no contact made

D. The purposes of these contacts included... (Check as many as apply.)

____ a. making arrangements for placing students
____ b. explaining expectations/process
____ c. discussing progress/needs of specific students
____ d. other Please state _____
____ e. not applicable/no contact made

III. WHAT WOULD MAKE IT BETTER?

A. I would like contact/communication with instructor more than in the past.
____ a. yes
____ b. no

B. If yes, I desire these contacts to be made...
____ a. once during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience
____ b. two times during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience
____ c. more than two times during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience Please state number _____

C. I would prefer this contact/communication to be made...(Check as many as apply.)
____ a. in person on site
____ b. via phone on site
____ c. with brief written response form
____ d. other Please state _____

D. The purpose for which I would want these contacts includes... (Check as many as apply.)

____ a. making arrangements for student placements
____ b. explaining purpose/program of field experience
____ c. discussing progress/needs of specific student(s)
____ d. other Please state _____

IV. EXPECTATIONS

A. I expect the field experience student to... (Check as many as apply.)
____ a. be punctual
____ b. call when unable to keep appointment
____ c. observe rather than participate
____ d. interact with the children
____ e. take initiative
____ f. carry out specific tasks with children each visit
____ g. dress professionally which means _____
____ h. other Please specify _____

B. Specific expectations I have of the instructor/supervisor are...
_____
_____

# APPENDIX E

# OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT FORM

# OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT FORM

Legend: N = Not met
P = Partially met
F = Fully met

_____ 1. FES observed and interacted in an early childhood program.

_____ 2. Each FES verbally expressed to CT and I/S happenings, questions, and insights about the field experience.

_____ 3. Each FES wrote about observations, concerns, and insights of field experiences.

_____ 4. Each CT and site administrator had knowledge of needs and expectations of FES and I/S, including college course goals.

_____ 5. Each CT communicated own needs, expectations, happenings, and concerns regarding field experience to I/S during the process

_____ 6. I/S gained knowledge about needs, concerns, and strengths of field experience program as perceived by CT, FES and site program administrators.

_____ 7. I/S selected representative group of FES, CT, and site administrators to form a field experience committee which met with I/S to share perspectives about field experience and develop unity and rapport.

____ 8. I/S developed a printed field experience handbook tailored to the course. This handbook was distributed and explained to all FES, CT, and site administrators.

____ 9. I/S conducted two field experience orientation sessions, one for CT and site administrators and the other for FES.

___ 10. I/S arranged for session in which site administrators and/or CT oriented FES to their respective sites just prior to FES first on-site participation time.

___ 11. I/S made on-site visits with FES and CT.

_____12. Decision-making college personnel recognized time and energies needed for quality field experience componenet of course and offered compensation to facilitate such.

## APPENDIX F

## STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT ASSESSMENT FORM

# STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT ASSESSMENT FORM

Legend: N = Not met
P = Partially met
F = Fully met

____ 1. Each FES followed a written schedule for a minimum of two hours weekly field experience for a minimum of ten weeks.

____ 2. Each week each FES wrote an entry in own log.

____ 3. Each CT documented FES participation weekly and presented to I/S at end of course.

____ 4. Documentation of FES stated verbal expressions appeared on CT report form.

____ 5. For each FES, the I/S log showed two recordings of verbal communication with I/S.

____ 6. All FES questionnaires revealed at least two incidents of verbal communication with CT regarding field experience.

____ 7. Each FES log contained a minimum of two incidents of verbal communication about field experience.

____ 8. Each FES weekly recorded observations, concerns, and insights in log.

____ 9. CT reported knowledge of needs and expectations.

____ 10. I/S log referred to at least one instance of I/S and CT communication with each other as stated.

____ 11. All CT state that I/S made at least one on-site communication.

____ 12. Five out of every ten questionnaires distributed to last school year persons were completed and returned.

____ 13. Seven out of every ten questionnaires distributed to this school year persons were completed and returned.

____ 14. A total of eight persons (three FES, three CT, and two site program administrators) met two times with I/S, conversing about field experience program as stated. One of these meetings occured in the formative state of the project and one occured at close of the project.

____ 15. All FES, CT, and site administrators had a field experience handbook.

____ 16. All CT and FES reported knowledge of handbook and implemented it.

____ 17. CT and site administrators attended orientation session. (I/S met separately with whoever could not attend.)

____ 18. FES attended campus class orientaton session. (I/S communicated separately with whoever could not attend.)

____ 19. Site administrators or CT presented copy of completed orientation agenda to I/S.

____ 20. I/S made a minimum of two on-site visits to each FES during the course/practicum time.

____ 21. College offered I/S contractual agreement which included compensation for facilitating field experience component of course.

# APPENDIX G

# EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELD EXPERIENCE HANDBOOK

# EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELD EXPERIENCE HANDBOOK

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Table of Contents . . . . . ii

Introduction . . . . . 1

The College Policies and the Role of the Student . . . . . 2

The Role of the Cooperating Teacher . . . . . 4

The Role of the Field Experience Supervisor . . . . . 5

Appendices

A. _____ Department of Human Service Forms . . . . . 6

B. Student Field Experience Report Forms . . . . . 10

C. Student Questionnaire . . . . . 21

D. Cooperating Teacher Report Form . . . . . 23

E. Cooperating Teacher/Site Administrator Questionnaire . . . . . 26

# INTRODUCTION

WELCOME to an EXCITING ADVENTURE. Time spent with children and early childhood professionals can be a learning experience and fun as well! This Field Experience Handbook is designed to provide all involved--students, cooperating teachers, center/school administrators, and the teacher education faculty--with the information to make this happening positive and meaningful.

This Handbook is specifically tailored to communicate general policies for the field experience portion of Introduction to Early Childhood Education course (Educ. 101). Also included are clarification of roles of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor of the field experience. We hope you will find this current document useful and that you will feel free to contribute to its continual updating.

This program consists of a minimum total of 30 clock hours in participating early childhood programs--preschools, child care centers, or kindergartens. Program placement of students is made by the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course instructor and is dependent upon a variety of factors: developmentally appropriate program model, students' experiential and educational background, students' age-level interest (infant-toddler, preschool, kindergarten age), students' available transportation, and other factors such as students' class and work schedules. College supervision of the field experience is provided by the course instructor. Selected programs reflect culturally, socially and socio-economically diverse settings based on learned society guidelines.

The aims are to provide a well-planned and organized field base enabling students to: (1) clarify their attitudes toward young children; (2) identify basic human developmental stages of children; (3) describe the primary characteristics of a competent teacher of young children; and (4) indicate components of a quality early childhood program.

Students who have successfully completed this program will be able to make decisions affecting their careers based upon authentic experiences with children. After being regularly involved with a group of young children, the students will begin to analyze their personal and professional qualities to determine avenues for further skill development.

This field experience program has been planned and continues with the cooperative efforts of College personnel and community early childhood program representatives to whom we are indebted. Periodical review and update by these groups is an integral part of the field experience process.

1. Students enrolled in Introduction to Early Childhood Education will have completed, prior to the first on-site field experience, the forms required by the Department of Human Services. See Appendix A.

2. Students will accept the responsibility of being present at every assigned field experience time. In cases of personal illness or death in the immediate family, students will immediately contact the cooperating teacher. Students will be on site at all other assigned field experience times.

3. Students should be highly sensitive to their image during the field experience. Each should establish an image as responsible, reputable, and efficient.

4. Student cooperation is to be demonstrated with all professional and ancillary employees of the early childhood center or school.

5. Students will be oriented to the center or school by the administrator/director or by the cooperating teacher.

6. Students should accept responsibilities and assignments and support the established early childhood program to the best of their abilities.

7. Students should demonstrate the highest professional standards in the use of language, writing and personal behavior.

8. Students should meet the standards of dress, personal appearance, and professional behavior expected of the school staff to which they are assigned. Personal appearance should reflect good grooming at all times.

9. Students should use tact and discretion in their actions and conversations with people in the center/school, fellow College students, and staff of the assigned program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. Students should assume the professional propriety necessary for keeping sensitive information about students, faculty, or administration derived from oberservation, records, or other sources confidential.

11. Students should represent the college by ethical, honest, and responsible conduct.

12. Students should complete the log, papers, and reports required by the instructor of the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course connected with this field experience. See Appendices B and C.

13. For many students, this will be their first field experience. Student adherence to the above policies is expected with the anticipation that cooperating teachers and site administrators will communicate and guide students to enhance their potentials.

# THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER

The cooperating teacher is equally important in the success of the field experience. Therefore, the college is requesting him/her to do the following:

1. Orient the student to his/her setting and group of children. This includes sharing in conversation and in print such items as:

   a. Philosophy of program
   b. Introduction of students to other staff as appropriate
   c. Daily schedule
   d. Special events - dates/times
   e. Staff/visitor policies or procedures
   f. Discipline policy - extent of student responsibility
   g. Expected behavior/dress
   h. Other specific information regarding observation or participation of student

2. Coordinate on-going activities with student.

   a. Provide the student with the opportunity for an active role with the children.
   b. Provide feedback to the students to help them evaluate their own field experience performance.
   c. Confer with the Supervisor of Field Experience during the term concerning the progress of the student.

3. Finalize the process.

   a. Complete Cooperating Teacher Report Form. See Appendix D.
   b. Complete Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire. See Appendix E.
   c. Return both Report Form and Questionnaire to the college in the stamped addressed envelope provided.

The Supervisor:

1. Determines program placement for students.

2. Remains informed of students', cooperating teachers', and site administrators' needs.

3. Orients cooperating teachers and site administrators regarding college policies.

4. Orients students from the college course and policies perspective.

5. Makes at least two on-site visits to each student during the course term.

6. Confers with student and cooperating teacher during on-site visits.

7. Addresses concerns or problems of students, cooperating teachers, and administrators and facilitates their resolution.

8. Gathers information from students, cooperating teachers, and administrators to enhance present and future program quality.

# APPENDIX A

## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

## FORMS

# MEDICAL STATEMENT

*(For child day care center or Type A family day care home employees and in-home aides)*



| Name of Employee/In-home Aide | Date of Birth |
|---|---|
| Street Address | |
| City, State, and Zip Code | |
| Date of Physicial Exam | |

This is to certify that I have examined the above-named person who is found to be:

1. free from apparent communicable disease,
2. free from tuberculosis verified by Mantoux skin test *(except for those with documentation of previously significant reaction)*,
3. physically fit to care for young children, and
4. immunized against:
   a. measles and mumps; or born before December 31, 1956, or has a disease history of measles and mumps; or exempt from this requirement for medical or religious reasons,
   b. rubella; or has a laboratory test demonstrating detectable rubella antibodies, or exempt from this requirement for medical or religious reasons,
   c. tetanus and diphtheria; or exempt from this requirement for medical or religious reasons.

| Name of Physician *(please print or type)* | Telephone Number ( ) |
|---|---|
| Street Address | |
| City, State, and Zip Code | |
| Physician's Signature | Date of Physician's Signature |

The physician may exempt the person from the above immunization requirements for medical reasons. The person may request exemption from the immunization requirements for religious reasons. See rule 5101:2-12-29 (centers); rule 5101:2-13-28 (type A homes); and rule 5101:2-15-11 (in-home aides) for further information.

**Note:** This is a sample form provided by ODHS which may be used to meet the requirements of the above rules.

## CHILD DAY CARE CONVICTIONS STATEMENT

ODHS 1301 (Rev. 2/87)

**Crimes Involving Child Abuse or Other Crimes of Violence**

This statement must be signed by every owner, administrator, and employee of a child day care center or type A home; every authorized type B home provider, emergency type B home caregiver, in-home aide, and all persons eighteen years of age and older who reside in a type A home or certified type B home. For centers and type A homes, this statement must be kept on file at the center or type A home. For certified type B home authorized providers and in-home aides, the statement must be kept on file at the county department of human services (see rules 5101:2-12-07, 5101:2-13-07, 5101:2-14-10, and 5101:2-15-10 of the Administrative Code).

I, *(please print or type)* _____, hereby attest that I have never been convicted of or pleaded guilty to child abuse or other crimes of violence set forth in Section 5104.09 of the Revised Code and that no child has been removed from my home pursuant to section 2151.353 of the Revised Code.

| Signature | Date |
|---|---|
| Street Address | |
| City, State, and Zip Code | Telephone Number |

**Section 5104.09. Prohibition Against Employment**

(A)(1) No individual who has been convicted of or pleaded guilty to child abuse in violation of section 2151.41, aggravated murder in violation of section 2903.01, murder in violation of section 2903.02, voluntary manslaughter in violation of section 2903.03, involuntary manslaughter in violation of section 2903.04, felonious assault in violation of section 2903.11, aggravated assault in violation of section 2903.12, assault in violation of section 2903.13, aggravated menacing in violation of section 2903.21, menacing in violation of section 2903.22, kidnapping in violation of section 2905.01, abduction in violation of section 2905.02, extortion in violation of section 2905.11, rape in violation of section 2907.02, sexual battery in violation of section 2907.03, felonious sexual penetration in violation of section 2907.12, aggravated arson in violation of section 2909.02, arson in violation of section 2909.03, disrupting public services in violation of section 2909.04, vandalism in violation of section 2909.05, aggravated robbery in violation of section 2911.01, robbery in violation of section 2911.02, aggravated burglary in violation of section 2911.11, burglary in violation of section 2911.12, inciting to violence in violation of section 2917.01, aggravated riot in violation of section 2917.02, riot in violation of section 2917.03, inducing panic in violation of section 2917.31, domestic violence in violation of section 2919.25, intimidation in violation of section 2921.03, escape in violation of section 2921.34, aiding escape or resistance to authority in violation of section 2921.35, carrying concealed weapons in violation of section 2923.12, having weapons while under disability in violation of section 2923.13, corruption of a minor in violation of section 2907.04, gross sexual imposition in violation of section 2907.05, sexual imposition in violation of section 2907.06, importuning in violation of section 2907.07, voyeurism in violation of section 2907.08, public indecency in violation of section 2907.09, or endangering children in violation of section 2919.22 of the Revised Code, or an existing or former offense of any municipal corporation, this state, any other state, or the United States that is substantially equivalent to any of these offenses shall be certified as an in-home aide or be employed in any capacity in or own or operate a child day-care center, type A family day-care home, type B family day-care home, or certified type B family day-care home.

Anyone who withholds information from, or falsifies information on, this statement is guilty of a misdemeanor of the first degree. If the offender is an owner of a center or type A home, the conviction constitutes grounds for denial, revocation, or refusal to renew a child day care license application. If the offender is an employee of the center or type A home, or is a person eighteen years of age or older who resides in the type A home, and if the owner had knowledge of, and acquiesced in, the commission of the offense, the conviction constitutes grounds for denial, revocation, or refusal to renew a child day care license application.

In addition to the above, the licensee of a type A home and each authorized type B home provider must sign the following statement:

I hereby attest that no one who resides in my home and who is under the age of eighteen has been adjudicated a delinquent child for committing a violation of any section listed in section 5104.09 Revised Code.

| Signature | Date |
|---|---|
| | |

Anyone who withholds information from, or falsifies information on, this statement is guilty of a misdemeanor of the first degree. If the offender is a licensee of a type A home, the conviction constitutes grounds for denial, revocation, or refusal to renew a child day care license application. If the offender is an employee of a type A home, and if the licensee had knowledge of, and acquiesced in, the commission of the offense, the conviction constitutes grounds for denial, revocation, or refusal to renew a child day care license application.

Note: This is a prescribed form which must be used to meet the requirements of section 5104.09 of the Revised Code. Failure to complete the form shall preclude issuance of the child day care license or certificate.



ODHS 1301 (Rev. 2/87)

# CHILD DAY CARE EMPLOYEE REFERENCE FORM
## Child Day Care Center / Type A Family Day Care Home

89

I. To be Completed by Employer

| Name of Child Day Care Facility | Name of Applicant | Position Applied For |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

Applicants for employment in a child day care center or type A family day care home must provide their employer with three references which attest to the applicant's suitability for employment in a center or type A home. These references must be on file by no later than thirty days after the applicant begins work (Rule 5101:2-12-08 and Rule 5101:2-13-08 of the Administrative Code). The person applying for the position above has given us your name as a reference on their application for employment with our facility. Please complete and return this form to me at my address listed below as soon as possible. All information received will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

| Employer Signature | |
|---|---|
| Name of Center | |
| Street Address | |
| City, State, and Zip Code | Telephone Number |

II. To be Completed by Person Giving Reference

1. How long have you known the applicant? _____

2. What is the nature of your association with the applicant (friend, employer, neighbor, etc.)? _____

3. In your opinion, is this person suitable for work in a child day care facility? _____

4. To the best of your knowledge, has the applicant ever been dismissed or asked to resign from a position because of inability to carry out work responsibilities in a child day care center? _____

5. To the best of your knowledge, has this person ever been convicted of or pleaded guilty to child abuse or any violent crimes or had a child removed from their home pursuant to Section 2151.353 of the Revised Code? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Additional Comments _____

| Signature | Date |
|---|---|
| | |

Note: This is a sample form provided by ODHS which may be used by centers and type A homes to meet the requirements of the rules listed above.

DHS 1300 (9/86)

APPENDIX B

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE

REPORT FORMS

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

#1

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Select (state) two (2) desirable teacher qualities as presented in Chapter 1 of the text* and/or from class presentation. Write specific examples of how these were expressed in the time you observed in the classroom.

2. Write two (2) specific examples of what you observed that were aspects of major influences on early childhood education as described in Chapter 2 (Progressive Education, Montessori, Comenius, Pestalozzi, etc.). State the name/major influence followed by the specific example of that person/incluence.

3. What was most impressive about your first day of observation--what was your "biggest surprise?"

* Feeney, S., Christensen, D., & Moravcik, E. (1991). Who am I in the lives of children? (4th ed.). New York: Macmillian.

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

#2

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

Using the format of Table 6.1, page 128 in text, make written observations of an incident that occurred during your time at the center this week.

| DESCRIPTION | INTERPRETATIONS/FEELINGS |
|---|---|
| | |

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

93
#3

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Chess and Thomas identify nine ways personalities differ (Chapter 4). State one of these characteristics and write what you observe about two different children in regard to the characteristic you have selected. Be specific.

2. Erikson describes a series of stages of childhood psychosocial development and Piaget focuses on childhood cognitive development (Chapter 4). As you observe children, note an example of one of these stages, name the stage and write what you saw.

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

Referring to Chapter 5 of text and referring to class handout regarding the Value of Children's Play, describe 4 specific incidents of child(ren) at play for each incident tell the concepts/values child(ren) are gaining from that experience.

| EXPERIENCE | CONCEPTS/VALUES GAINED |
|---|---|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

95
#5

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. After reading Chapter 7, focus on the charts on pages 148, 149, 152, 153, 155 and 156. Also feel free to express any of your related concerns regarding these standards.

   a. Describe a field experience incident/situation which carries out a SAFETY STANDARD. Identify the standard described.

   b. Describe a field experience incident/situation which carries out a HEALTH STANDARD. Identify the standard described.

   c. Describe a field experience incident/situation which carries out one of the suggestions on pages 155 or 156 of the text.

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

96
#6

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

Before going to your field experience, study Chapter 8, specifically noting the LEARNING ENVIRONMENT CHECKLIST on pages 191-196. Relate this information to your field experience setting.

1. Center (area of room) you have selected to describe.

2. Description of contents of this center: furniture, materials, organization.

3. Description of behavior of one or more children who used this center during your observation. What was child(ren) doing? Be specific.

4. Tell what skills and/or concepts child(ren) gained from this experience.



102

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education

97
#7

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Record a specific incident you observed which enhanced a child's self-esteem. Describe the setting, the words expressed by teacher and child, the teacher and child's body language and the child's ultimate response. (Refer to instructor's presentation "How to Build a Child's Self-Esteem.")

2. Look at the ANTICIPATING AND PREVENTING PROBLEMS on page 211 of the text. Identify a suggestion you saw implemented during your observation. Describe the setting, words, body language where this suggested was implemented.

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM 98
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education #8

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Do A or B:

A. Talk briefly with your field experience teacher. What are his/her written lesson plan responsibilities? What kinds of things are written on the lesson plan? What are the sources of ideas for activities, setting up environment, etc.? (Use back of paper as needed)

B. Record an activity you observed of field experience child(ren) involved in these areas: (Refer to p. 242-243 of text)

(1) Inquiry:

(2) Language:

(3) Physical:

(4) Creative:

2. Do A or B:

A. Tell what you saw/heard teacher do to simulate child(ren)'s physical development.

B. Tell what you observed child(ren) doing to encourage their own physical development in:

(1) Sensory curriculum (p. 258):

(2) Small muscle curriculum (p. 262):

(3) Large muscle curriculum (p. 265):

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM 99
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education 89

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Write about a creative experience you observed in the classroom. Tell what child was doing and how program structure, environment, materials and teacher stimulated this creativity (Chapter 12).

2. Describe two incidents in which the teacher specifically assisted a child's (or children's) language/literacy skills (Chapter 13).

(1)

(2)

STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCE OBSERVATION FORM 100
Education 101
Introduction to Early Childhood Education #10

NAME _____ OBSERVATION DATE _____

TIME OF OBSERVATION _____ to _____

AGE OF CHILDREN _____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN _____

1. Note the inquiry processes on page 351 of the text. Name two of these processes and tell how children/teacher expressed these in the classroom.

2. Observe teacher and environment noting any specific accommodations for INDIVIDUAL NEEDS of children (physical, behavioral, emotional, cognitive, social). Record. If you do not observe such, ask teacher for tips on meeting individual needs. Record response. Reference: Chapter 15.

APPENDIX C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

# FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Place an X in the blank to the left of each item which indicates your response.

1. Before I had my first field experience for the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course I...

   _____ a. was told by course instructor what to expect.
   _____ b. was told by site administrator or teacher what to expect.
   _____ c. was not informed by anyone about what to expect
   _____ d. other _____

2. While at my field experience, I talked with my cooperation teacher...

   _____ a. every time I was there.
   _____ b. more than half the time I was there.
   _____ c. less than half the time I was there.
   _____ d. no time I was there.

3. The course instructor/supervisor visited me while at the field experience site...

   _____ a. 0 times
   _____ b. 1 time
   _____ c. 2 times
   _____ d. more than 2 times

4. The college classroom presentations and discussions...

   _____ a. frequently mentioned field experiences.
   _____ b. sometimes mentioned field experiences.
   _____ c. never mentioned field experiences.

5. I expect a field experience cooperating teacher to...
   Check all that apply:

   _____ a. let me observe rather than participate
   _____ b. tell me about the daily routine
   _____ c. give me a specific task with children each time I visit
   _____ d. tell me what to expect from the children
   _____ e. tell me how to handle specific situations as they occur (i.e. how to assist at art table, bathroom procedure, guiding child behavior)

6. Other things I would like a cooperating teacher to do are:

   _____

   _____

7. The things that would improve the Introduction to Early Childhood Education course and its field experiences are:

   _____

   _____

# APPENDIX D

## COOPERATING TEACHER REPORT FORM

# COOPERATING TEACHER REPORT FORM

Student Name _____ Site Name _____

Day Attending _____ Time _____ to _____

| | Attendance Date | Student Initial | Topic of discussion w/student | Teacher Initial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Week 1: | | | | |
| Week 2: | | | | |
| Week 3: | | | | |
| Week 4: | | | | |
| Week 5: | | | | |
| Week 6: | | | | |
| Week 7: | | | | |
| Week 8: | | | | |
| Week 9: | | | | |
| Week 10: | | | | |

Comments regarding student's performance and personal qualities:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

I received a field experience handbook. Yes ___ No ___

I was able to implement the plans outlined in the field experience handbook. Yes ___ No ___

I received information about the needs and expectation of...

field experience students. Yes ___ No ___

instructor/supervisor. Yes ___ No ___

college/course goals. Yes ___ No ___

Cooperating Teacher Signature _____

Date completed _____

APPENDIX E

COOPERATING TEACHER/SITE ADMINISTRATOR

QUESTIONNAIRE

COOPERATING TEACHER/SITE ADMINISTRATOR

QUESTIONNAIRE



Place an X in the blank to the left of each item which indicates your response.

I. POSITION. Your role in your early childhood program is...

_____ a. teacher
_____ b. assistant teacher
_____ c. administrator
_____ d. other Please state _____

II. HOW WAS IT? Referring to Fall 1991...

A. The number of times the instructor of Introduction to Early Childhood Education course contacted you while student(s) did field experience in your classroom/center was:

_____ a. 0
_____ b. 1
_____ c. 2
_____ d. 3 or more

B. The number of times you contacted instructor of Introduction to Early Childhood Education course while student(s) did field experience in your classroom/center was:

_____ a. 0
_____ b. 1
_____ c. 2
_____ d. 3 or more

C. The method of these contacts for any of the above was... (Check as many as apply.)

_____ a. in person on site
_____ b. via phone at site
_____ c. brief written response form
_____ d. other Please state _____
_____ e. no contact made

D. The purposes of these contacts included... (Check as many as apply.)

_____ a. making arrangements for placing students
_____ b. explaining expectations/process
_____ c. discussing progress/needs of specific students
_____ d. other Please state _____
_____ e. not applicable/no contact made

III. WHAT WOULD MAKE IT BETTER?

A. I would like contact/communication with instructor more than in the past.

_____ a. yes
_____ b. no

B. If yes, I desire these contacts to be made...

_____ a. once during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience
_____ b. two times during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience
_____ c. more than two times during the ten-week period student is involved in field experience. Please state number _____

C. I would prefer this contact/communication to be made... (Check as many as apply.)

_____ a. in person on site
_____ b. via phone on site
_____ c. with brief written response form
_____ d. other Please state _____

D. The purpose for which I would want these contacts includes... (Check as many as apply.)

_____ a. making arrangements for student placements
_____ b. explaining purpose/program of field experience
_____ c. discussing progress/needs of specific student(s)
_____ d. other Please state _____

IV. EXPECTATIONS

A. I expect the field experience student to... (Check as many as apply)

_____ a. be punctual
_____ b. call when unable to keep appointment
_____ c. observe rather than participate
_____ d. interact with the children
_____ e. take initiative
_____ f. carry out specific tasks with children each visit
_____ g. dress professionally which means _____
_____ h. other Please specify _____

B. Specific expectations I have of the instructor/supervisor are...

_____

_____

_____